

problem is so severe that options should be pared back across the board and that Congress should take that action. Others say that business as usual should continue, that this is a problem that has affected just a handful of companies.

The principles I have described today lay out a third path—a path that will ensure that broad-based stock options can continue to be a useful tool for deserving workers, shareholders, and the economy as a whole, while at the same time curbing abuses by those in the executive suites whose conduct is over the line.

On the Science and Technology Subcommittee, which I chair, we have heard again and again how important these stock options are. There is no question that is correct. But I think it is also correct to say that the job of cleaning up corporate corruption is not going to be complete until Congress acts to curb the abuse of stock options.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to put in place tough, new rules that will ensure that stock options remain broad based, but also address this issue of abuse that, unfortunately, has drawn options and their value into question.

#### AN UNWARRANTED BLOW TO GLOBAL FAMILY PLANNING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my very deep regret that the Bush administration has decided not to release the \$34 million allocated for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, UNFPA. I would ask the White House to reconsider its decision.

At stake here is vital assistance for needy individuals throughout the developing world, living under the threat of HIV infection and deteriorating health conditions.

Indeed, it is a shame that such assistance—assistance that can save lives—is being held hostage by domestic politics, and the misconceptions of the anti-choice wing of the Republican Party.

I would remind the administration that the \$34 million was appropriated by Congress in a spirit of bipartisan consensus, after 2 months of negotiations. During these talks there was never any question whether or not to allocate the funds, but simply how much.

The White House's own budget proposal for fiscal year 2002 included \$25 million for the fund, \$3.5 million more than allocated by the Clinton administration.

Within this context, the administration's decision is all the more perplexing. It stands as painful proof that the debate over U.S. support for international family planning has been distorted all out proportion.

In particular, there remains a belief, in some quarters, that the United Nations Fund for Population Activities either condones or even assists in abortion and coercive sterilization.

This is, at best, nothing but hearsay. And if such proof does exist, why haven't we seen or heard anything substantive about it?

With respect to China, in May the State Department sent a mission to investigate such allegations, and it found no evidence at all of that the fund was involved, in any way, in abortion or coercive sterilization. A month before, a British delegation drew a similar conclusion.

For the record, I would like to quote directly from the State Department's conclusions. "We find no evidence that UNFPA has knowingly supported or participated in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization in [China]."

In light of this finding, the report recommends, and I quote, "that not more than \$34 million which has already been appropriated be released to UNFPA."

I would also argue that it is precisely because of the questions raised about China's policies, that United Nations presence there becomes that much more important. The United Nations Fund for Population Activities remains the best way to do this.

Only last year, Secretary of State Colin Powell praised the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, saying that it was engaged in "critical population and assistance to developing countries."

This explains why the Department of State provided \$600,000 to the fund for sanity supplies, clean undergarments, and emergency infant delivery kits for Afghan refugees in Iran, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan.

The facts speak for themselves. The United Nations Fund for Population Activities does not subsidize abortion services in any country. Its executive director, Madame Thoraya Ahmed Obaid, has said that the fund would cease its family planning program in China, if any allegations of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization could be verified.

I would also argue that we would be wise to focus on the wider role that the United Nations Fund for Population Activities plays, most notably in the critical area of HIV prevention. And I would remind my colleagues of just a few of the troubling facts revealed at the recent AIDS conference in Barcelona.

In Botswana, for example—a country where 38 percent of the adult population is infected with HIV—20 percent of high-school-age students believe that you can tell whether a person has HIV/AIDS simply by looking at them.

In Malawi, where 15 percent of all adults are HIV positive, 64 percent of young men admit to not using a condom with their most recent sexual partner. The scourge of AIDS throughout sub-Saharan Africa is a human tragedy of terrifying proportions.

How can we turn our backs on those not yet infected, especially when the reason for doing so is based on un-

founded allegations and a misunderstanding of the term "family planning."

There are no hidden meanings; there is no secret agenda. Family planning does not condone or promote abortion. Simply put, family planning means: women able to control their reproductive destinies; couples given the information necessary to make their own choices about family size and the timing of births; health care officials reaching out to adolescents and young adults, as a means to educate them, and in turn prevent HIV infection and unwanted pregnancies.

Healthy families—the heart of any healthy society—depend upon women being able to make informed choices. The United Nations Fund for Population Activities helps women do just that—make a choice—which I hold to be a fundamental right of women everywhere, regardless of their economic circumstances.

Women here in the United States take such information for granted, and we can not forget that this is all too often unavailable to poor women in the developing world.

How to protect themselves from HIV or other sexually transmitted diseases, how to space pregnancies so that they can better manage the size of their families, and how to lower the risks of childbirth and increase their chances of delivering healthy babies—this is at the heart of the information the United Nations Fund for Population Activities provides. This strikes me as hardly immoral or illegal.

In closing, Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues that the world's population today stands at more than six billion—a figure that shows no signs of stabilizing. In fact, the United Nations estimates this number could double, to 12 billion, by the year 2050.

The brunt of this growth will impact precisely those areas least able to absorb it—namely, the developing world. Overpopulation has already caused significant problems, like malnutrition, disease, environmental degradation, and political instability.

If we in the United States bury our heads in the sand here, it will become increasingly likely that overpopulation could overwhelm such fragile societies.

Given such alarming facts, the purpose of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities—to reduce poverty, improve health and raise living standards around the world—will become only more important in the years to come. The United States, in my mind, has two options: one, either we help support international family planning efforts, in a way that is both responsible and accountable; or two, we relinquish our leadership role, and turn our backs on the developing world.

The Bush Administration seems to have taken the latter course, and I can only hope that it reconsiders its decision and will do what is right.

It should release the \$34 million allocated to the United Nations Fund for

Population Activities. Failure to do so would set an unfortunate precedent.

# TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT JOHN H. MORENO AND ALL FALLEN HEROES

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, last month I attended the dedication of the Massachusetts Vietnam War Memorial in Worcester, MA where I joined my fellow veterans and their families to memorialize the 1,537 heroes from Massachusetts who gave their lives in Vietnam.

During the ceremony, I was passed a copy of a poem Mrs. Eileen Moreno wrote in honor of her son, Sergeant John H. Moreno, whose name graces the Place of Names in Worcester. John Moreno, who grew up in Brookline, loved baseball and the Red Sox, and planned to attend art school so that he could teach art at an elementary school, was like so many brave young men and women who gave so much to their families, communities, and country.

With her compelling tribute to her son, Mrs. Moreno reminds us all of the high price of freedom, a price paid both by the soldiers who went thousands of miles away to protect our Nation and the families who remember their loved ones. I thank her for passing along these words of tribute and respectfully ask unanimous consent to print her poem, "Memorium—Elegy for a Son," in the RECORD so that others may read her beautiful words.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## MEMORIUM—ELEGY FOR A SON

Yes, we still grieve.  
In the stillness of the night  
Echos the silent primal howl  
Of rage and refusal to believe.  
In private moments of the day to day  
We weep our quiet tears;  
Sorrow does not lessen with the  
passage of the years.  
Oh, yes we weep and hide our  
desolation with words like duty,  
gallantry and pride.  
Still we cry.  
For the bright, sweet child who was,  
We cry.  
For the valiant man he became,  
We cry.  
We grieve.  
With dry and sighting eyes  
We weep tears that can't relieve.  
For his loneliness, his fear, his pain  
Knowing our aching, empty arms  
Cannot hold him close again,  
We cry.  
But for the solace that it gives,  
In the love he left for us in our care  
And in his memory we'll forever share  
Still he lives—Eternity is his legacy.

## LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator

KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 16, 2001 in Newmarket, NH. Thung Phetakoune, 62, a man of Laotian descent, died of injuries he suffered in an attack apparently motivated by racial hatred. According to authorities, Richard Labbe, 35, assaulted the victim amid an anti-Asian tirade. Phetakoune died from injuries stemming from a fractured skull, subsurface bleeding, and swelling of the brain.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

## EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, a recent article from the New York Times describes the infestation of spruce bark beetles on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska. This is another aspect of global climate change that has deadly implications in my state. On the Kenai Peninsula, the spruce bark beetle has infested nearly 95 percent of the spruce trees, which represents about four million acres of dead or dying forest. Some scientists believe that a succession of warm years in Alaska has allowed spruce bark beetles to reproduce at twice their normal rate. This warming trend in Alaska has coincided with a huge outbreak of these beetles and the death of a forest nearly twice the size of Yellowstone National Park. This terrible situation, in one of my state's most beautiful tourist destinations, has created a dangerous environment for a large scale fire in this region.

Over half of the people of Alaska live in the path of this fire.

The Forest Service, under the previous Administration, in my State would not permit the selective cutting of infested trees, which would have mitigated, if not stopped, the outbreak of the deadly beetle. When timber sales were offered in this area extreme environmental lawsuits stopped any removal of the ever growing fuel load. My state is now in a very dangerous situation—eight years of beetle kill stands in the forests on the Kenai Peninsula and the insect continues to spread.

This article demonstrates that. I call it to the attention of the Senate because of the emphasis placed on fires already started in the West and that are ongoing.

This is the most deadly situation I have ever encountered in terms of potential fire and the hazard in this enormous

area—4 million acres of dead or dying trees caused by this beetle. I think it ought to be dealt with by all concerned. I hope we have some money in the regular bill for this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD. I call it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Science Times, June 25, 2002]

ON HOT TRAIL OF TINY KILLER IN ALASKA

(By Timothy Egan)

SOLDOTNA, Alaska—Edward Berg has a pair of doctorates, one in philosophy and another in botany, but for the last decade he has been a forensic detective in the forest, trying to solve a large murder mystery.

The evidence surrounds him on his home in the Kenai Peninsula: nearly four million acres of white spruce trees, dead or dying from an infestation of beetles—the largest kill by insects of any forest in North America, federal officials say.

Beetles have been gnawing at spruce trees for thousands of years. Why, Dr. Berg wondered, has this infestation been so great? After matching climate records to the rate of dying trees, Dr. Berg, who works at the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, believes he has come up with an answer.

He says a succession of warm years in Alaska has allowed spruce bark beetles to reproduce at twice their normal rate. Hungry for the sweet lining beneath the bark, the beetles have swarmed over the stands of spruce, overwhelming the trees' normal defense mechanisms.

If Dr. Berg is correct—and he has won many converts as well as some skeptics—then the dead spruce forest of Alaska may well be one of the world's most visible monuments to climate change. On the Kenai, nearly 95 percent of spruce trees have fallen to the beetle. Now, conditions are ripe for a large fire and could lead to bigger changes in the ecosystem, affecting moose, bear, salmon and other creatures that have made the peninsula, just a few hours' drive from Anchorage, a tourist mecca.

"The chief reason why the beetle outbreak has been the largest and the longest is that we have had an unprecedented run of warm summers," said Dr. Berg, 62 a soft-spoken man in suspenders and running shoes.

Temperatures in Alaska have risen sharply in the last 30 years, causing sea ice to break up off the northern coastlines, some glaciers to recede and permafrost, to melt. But until Dr. Berg began matching raising temperatures to the number of trees killed by beetles, no one of had tied the death of a forest nearly twice the size of Yellowstone National Park to warming temperatures.

Dr. Berg believes the larger culprit is global warming, brought on by increased emissions of greenhouse gases, which trap heat in the atmosphere. But that is a bigger debate, one which Dr. Berg's findings for other forests vulnerable to bugs is that as climate warms in the north, some species of evergreen trees that cover vast acreage could be mowed down by an ever-expanding population of beetles.

The dead spruce forest of Alaska is also a lesson, to some ecologists, of how warmer temperatures present intractable problems for living things anchored to a certain area. People can adapt, or even more, but trees that have been growing in one area for 8,000 years cannot—at least not quickly enough.

Other scientists who work on global warming issues are now looking at Dr. Berg's findings.